REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-52 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47 and 48 are independent.

Allowed Claims

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 1-3, 5-37, 43-50, and 52 are allowed.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 102; Tanishima

Claims 38-40 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanishima (U.S. Patent 5,953,045). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 38 and 39

Claims 38 and 39 are directed to an electronic apparatus (e.g. Figure 1B, Electronic Apparatus 300) capable of utilizing an output signal from a millimeter wave receiver (e.g., Millimeter wave receiver 200). The electronic apparatus includes a connector (e.g., connector 40) connected with the millimeter wave receiver. A control signal transmission circuit (e.g., Control Signal Transmitter 42) transmits a control signal indicating information to the connector.

Thus, the connector in claims 38 and 39 serves both to receive an output signal from a millimeter wave receiver and to transmit a control

signal, i.e., has two-way signal capability (see present specification at page 11, lines 10-14).

The Office Action relies on Tanishima's cable 71 for teaching the claimed connector. Tanishima's cable 71, however, only supplies an output video signal to a television receiver 61 (see column 6, lines 32 to 36; Fig. 5; column 9, lines 17 to 23), i.e., a one-way signal capability. The television receiver 61 does not transmit a control signal to the cable 71 connector (the sections relied on disclose an FSK modulator that performs modulation based on a channel selection signal selected by a subscriber; that signal is not received by way of cable 71). Thus, unlike Tanishima, the present invention includes a control signal transmission circuit which transmits a control signal indicating information to the connector.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Tanishima fails to teach at least the claimed connector, and control signal transmission circuit transmitting a control signal indicating information provided in said electronic apparatus to the connector. Thus, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 38 and 39 be withdrawn.

Claims 40 and 51

Claim 40 is directed to an electronic apparatus (e.g., Fig. 15, Electronic Apparatus 310) having a function of receiving television broadcasting that includes a millimeter wave receiving circuit (e.g., Antenna 27 and Amplifier 28), a broadcasting wave demodulation circuit

(e.g., Down-Converter 29), and inverse frequency arranger (e.g., Inverse Frequency Arranger 30), and a transmission circuit (e.g., Transmitter 35). The broadcasting wave demodulation circuit down-converts the millimeter waves to the frequency band of the broadcasting waves. The inverse frequency arranger changes the frequency arrangement of output signals of the broadcasting wave demodulation circuit.

The Office Action relies on frequency converter 51f for teaching the claimed, of Tanishima, broadcasting wave demodulation circuit and local oscillator 51e for teaching the claimed inverse frequency arranger. The local oscillator 51e outputs a local oscillation frequency signal (column 6, lines 18-21). A frequency converter 51f-2 mixes the millimeter wave signal with the local oscillation signal from the oscillator and generates an intermediate frequency signal of 100 MHz (column 6, lines 28 to 32). The original input video signal is at 70 MHz (see Fig. 4). Thus, the local oscillator serves to regulate the frequency that the frequency converter down-converts to.

It appears that the Office Action is interpreting the claim as though the local oscillator effecting the output of the frequency converter teaches the claimed inverse frequency arranger "changing" the frequency arrangement of output signals. In the present invention, however, the inverse frequency arranger 30 is connected to the output of the down converter 29. Furthermore, as recited in claim 51, the inverse frequency arranger converts waves from an intermediate frequency band to a

frequency band of terrestrial waves. In order to clarify these aspects of the claimed invention, claims 40 and 51 have been amended.

Applicants submit that Tanishima fails to teach at least the claimed inverse frequency arranger in an arrangement where it receives output signals of a broadcasting wave demodulation circuit. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 40 and 51 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103; Tanishima, Beasley

Claims 41 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanishima (U.S. Patent No. 5,953,045) in view of Beasley (U.S. Patent No. 5,321,736). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 41 is directed to a repeater (e.g., Fig. 14A, repeater 500) connected to an antenna receiving broadcasting for making a relay to a terminal comprising, among other things, a broadcasting wave input circuit (e.g., broadcasting signal input 16), a frequency arranging circuit (e.g., frequency arranger 17), and a connection unit (e.g., connector 58) for connection with the terminal.

The Office Action relies on frequency converter 51f for teaching the claimed broadcasting wave input circuit and local oscillator 51e, of Tanishima, for teaching the claimed frequency arranging circuit. The local oscillator 51e outputs a local oscillation frequency signal (column 6, lines 18-21). A frequency converter 51f-2 mixes the millimeter wave

signal with the local oscillation signal from the oscillator and generates an intermediate frequency signal of 100 MHz (column 6, lines 28 to 32). The original input video signal is at 70 MHz (see Fig. 4). Thus, the local oscillator serves to regulate the frequency that the frequency converter down-converts to.

Similar to the above for claim 40, Applicants have amended claim 41 in order to clarify that the frequency arranging circuit is connected to the output of the broadcasting wave input circuit and to clarify what is meant by changing "frequency arrangement", e.g., that one of a plurality of signals is changed in frequency, thereby changing the frequency arrangement of the plurality of signals.

Applicants submit that Tanishima fails to teach the structure recited in claim 41 as amended, and fails to teach at least the claimed frequency arranging circuit.

The Office Action states that Tanishima fails to teach a power receptor circuit and instead relies on Beasley for making up for the deficiency. Applicants submit that Beasley also fails to teach the claimed frequency arranging circuit and thus fails to make up for the deficiency of Tanishima.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 41 and 42 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs (Reg. No. 48,222), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1. 17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: _____
Terrell C. Birch
Reg. No. 19,382

RWD
TCB/RWD/ph/lab
(703) 205-8000
0033-0651P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000